

## REMARKS

This Reply is in response to the Office Action mailed August 5, 2010.

### I. Summary of Examiner's Rejections

In the Office Action dated August 31, 2010, Claims 1 and 27-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 as being indefinite. Claims 1-6, 9-10, 13-14, 18, 21, 24, 27-31 and 33-42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Radley-Smith (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0030595).

### II. Summary of Applicant's Amendments

The present Reply amends Claims 1, 5, 13, 27-28 and 30-31; and adds Claim 43, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration Claims 1-6, 9-10, 13-14, 18, 21, 24, 27-31 and 33-43. Reconsideration of the Application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

### III. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

In the Office Action dated August 31, 2010, Claims 1 and 27-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 as being indefinite. Specifically, the Examiner asserted that there was insufficient antecedent basis for "the third content" in Claim 1 and "the third display device" in Claims 27-30. Claims 1, 27-28 and 30 have been amended, as shown above, to clarify the antecedent basis for these terms. Claim 29 is dependent on Claim 28 and, therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 28 provides antecedent basis for "the third display device" as claimed in Claim 29. Reconsideration of these rejections is respectfully requested.

### IV. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

In the Office Action dated August 31, 2010, Claims 1-6, 9-10, 13-14, 18, 21, 24, 27-31 and 33-42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Radley-Smith (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0030595).

#### **Claim 1**

Claim 1, as amended, recites:

1. *(Currently Amended): A system for providing a sequence of content in a modular presentation system, comprising:*

*a plurality of display devices, wherein each display device includes a corresponding plurality of a processor and memory system to control each corresponding display device, and wherein each display device neighbors at least one other display device and at least three of the plurality of display devices are in visual proximity to each other;*

*an input device that receives input of a gesture to move a first content from a first display device of the plurality of display devices to a second display device, wherein a second content of the second display device is moved from the second display device of the plurality of display devices to a third display device, wherein a propagation order of a third content followed by the second content followed by the first content represents the sequence; and*

*wherein the processor corresponding to the first display device*

*interprets a direction to move the first content from the first display device based on the gesture, wherein the gesture is made with a flick which indicates content to be moved and a direction without designating a destination display device,*

*determines the destination display device to which the first content is to be moved, based on the direction indicated by the gesture and the position of the plurality of display devices, wherein the destination display device is the second display device,*

*establishes a peer-to-peer connection between the first display device and the second display device,*

*propagates the first content of the first display device to the second display device using the peer-to-peer connection,*

*propagates the second content of the second display device to the third display device, wherein the third display device is determined based on the direction indicated by the gesture, and*

*wherein initiating the gesture changes the content displayed on all of the first display device, the second display device and the third display device.*

Radley-Smith discloses a bracelet with information display and inputting capability comprises twelve segments hinged together to allow the bracelet to be folded around the wrist of a user. (Abstract). FIG. 1A is a block circuit diagram of electrical components mounted in and on the bracelet. As shown in FIG. 1A, the bracelet 11 comprises an information processing unit 15 for receiving inputted information and for generating display signals, a display device 16 (also referred to as display means), 16 for displaying information derived from the information processing unit 15, and an information inputting device 17 (also referred to as an information inputting means) for inputting information to the information processing unit 15 by manual interaction with the inputting device 17. (Paragraph [0077]).

Claim 1, as amended, recites a plurality of display devices, wherein each display device includes a corresponding plurality of a processor and memory system to control each corresponding display device, and wherein each display device neighbors at least one other

display device and at least three of the plurality of display devices are in visual proximity to each other.

Applicant respectfully submits that, in Radley-Smith, a single processing unit appears to be shared by the various segments of the bracelet. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that Radley-Smith does not disclose or render obvious that each display device includes a corresponding plurality of a processor and memory system to control each corresponding display device, as recited by Claim 1, as amended.

Claim 1, as amended, further recites establishing a peer-to-peer connection between the first display device and the second display device, and propagates the first content of the first display device to the second display device using the peer-to-peer connection.

As noted above, in Radley-Smith each segment of the controller does not include its own processor and memory space, instead all of the segments are centrally controlled by a single processing unit. Although the bracelet, when considered as a single entity, may be able to receive and transmit information from and to other entities over telecommunication systems such as may be used with pagers and mobile phones, the individual segments of the bracelet do not communicate with each other. Additionally, the individual segments do not establish peer-to-peer connections with each other and then use that connection to exchange information with each other. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Radley-Smith does not disclose or render obvious the embodiment of Claim 1, as amended.

Claim 1, as amended, further recites that the processor corresponding to the first display device determines the destination display device to which the first content is to be moved, based on the direction indicated by the gesture and the position of the plurality of display devices, wherein the destination display device is the second display device.

Applicant respectfully submits that although Radley-Smith appears to be able to receive input through a touch screen, Radley-Smith does not appear to disclose a processor corresponding to the first display device that determines the destination display device to which the first content is to be moved, based on the direction indicated by the gesture and the position of the plurality of display devices. Instead, in Radley-Smith, input is received at particular points on the screen which indicate particular actions. For example, in the game shown in Figure 6, the plane is controlled by touching particular points on the screen, not by making a gesture. Applicant respectfully submits that Radley-Smith does not disclose or render obvious the embodiment of Claim 1, as amended.

In view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1 is neither anticipated by nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

#### **Claims 5, 13 and 31**

The comments provided above with respect to Claim 1 are hereby incorporated by reference. Claims 5, 13 and 31 have been similarly amended to more clearly recite the embodiments therein. For similar reasons as provided above with respect to Claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 5, 13 and 31 are likewise neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

#### **Claims 2-4, 6, 9-10, 14, 18, 21, 24, 27-30 and 33-42**

Claims 2-4, 6, 9-10, 14, 18, 21, 24, 27-30 and 33-42 depend from and include all of the features of Claims 1, 5, 13 or 31. Claims 2-4, 6, 9-10, 14, 18, 21, 24, 27-30 and 33-42 are not addressed in detail herein. Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are allowable at least as depending from an allowable independent claim, and further in view of the amendments to the independent claims, and the comments provided above. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

#### **V. Additional Amendments**

Claim 43 has been newly added by the present Reply. Applicant respectfully requests that new claim 43 be included in the Application and considered therewith.

#### **VI. Request for Interview**

In the event the above remarks fail to place the case in condition for allowance, Applicant respectfully requests the opportunity to interview with the Examiner at their convenience, and prior to issuance of a subsequent Office Action, to assist in expediting prosecution.

#### **VII. Conclusion**

In view of the above amendments and remarks set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully

requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 7, 2011

By: /Nathan L. Feld/  
Nathan L. Feld  
Reg. No. 59,725

FLIESLER MEYER LLP  
650 California Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94108  
Telephone: (415) 362-3800  
Facsimile: (415) 362-2928  
Customer No. 23910